



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/830,226	04/23/2001	Paul Aubrey Greenfield	09/100.000	3270

27201 7590 09/21/2006

UNISYS CORPORATION
25725 JERONIMO ROAD, MS400
MISSION VIEJO, CA 92691

EXAMINER

CAO, DIEM K

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2194

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/830,226	Applicant(s) GREENFIELD ET AL.	
	Examiner Diem K. Cao	Art Unit 2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,10-14,16-20,23-26,28,30-34,37-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____


WILLIAM THOMSON
ADVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3-7, 10-14, 16-20, 23-26, 28, 30-34 and 37-40 are pending. Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 5, 14, 16, 19, 20, 23-26, 28, 30, and cancelled claims 2, 8, 9, 15, 21, 22, 27, 29, 35 and 36.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/30/2006 has been entered.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 1, 3-7, 10-14, 16-20, 23-26 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1 recites "said components containing object oriented methods", which is unclear because "said components" is used to refer to "user interface software components" or "executable software components". Examiner interprets "said components" is used to refer to "executable software components" as recites in claim 28.

Claim 14 suffers the same problem as claim 1.

Claims 17, 19, 20, 23-26 should depend on claim 14, not claim 11 as recited.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1, 3-7,10-14, 16-20, 23-26, 28, 30-34 and 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phanouriou et al. (Transforming Command-Line Driven Systems to Web Applications) in view of Eager et al. (U.S. 5,969,200) further in view of Apte et al. (U.s. 6,662,236 B1).**

As to claim 1, Phanouriou teaches a method for adapting a legacy software application (Idrag program; page 2 and abstract), created from legacy source code and developed for an environment comprising a centralized computing resource interconnected to a series of computer terminal devices (Unix computers; page 2), to a network environment (Web; page 2), wherein the network environment comprises a system of distributed, interconnected network computing resources (computers have access to Internet; page 2 and abstract), the method comprising the steps of providing a software application (Javamatic; abstract) which utilizes the legacy code to produce a series of user interface software components (GUI components; page 7, section UI Mapping Rules) to provide a graphical user interface providing at least data entry and display facilities (GUI; page 2, and Figs on pages 3, pages 6-7), the graphical user interface being embodied in series of executable software components (See left middle tree of Fig. 5; page 7 and

Art Unit: 2194

associated text) that provide the functionality for interaction with the legacy software application (anyone can visit a Web page ... When a user visits a Web page ... visualization and further analysis; page 2 and Figs. A, B, C), the components being executable by at least one of the computing resources in the network environment (The HTTP server returns an applet that is the Javamatic interface client; page 5 and Fig. 3), and wherein upon execution, the computing resource is caused to interconnect with the legacy software application over the network so as to interact with the legacy software application in the transmission or receipt of information to and from the legacy software application (Fig. 3 and associated text; pages 5-6).

Phanouriou does not explicitly teach the legacy application includes interface specification definitions which include definitions of screen formats, the legacy source including data fields, the user interface software component are generated from the screen format definitions and executable by a scripting language running on the interconnected network computing resource, and the executable software components containing object oriented methods for setting and getting values of the data fields.

However, Eager teaches the legacy application includes interface specification definitions which include definitions of screen formats (Information stored in the user interface ... structures 118; col. 23, lines 35-45), the legacy source including data fields (inherent from a legacy application, and application always contains data). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Phanouriou and Eager because Eager's system provides a method to transitions an entire enterprise to a distributed infrastructure.

Apte teaches the user interface software components are executable by a scripting language running on the interconnected network computing resource (JavaScript complements Java ... of an applet; col. 2, lines 38-48 and Fig. 2), and the executable software components containing object oriented methods for setting and getting values of the data fields (inherent from the language is Java, and get method provided in Appendix A; cols. 7-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Phanouriou, Eager and Apte to the system of Phanouriou because it can expose useful properties of Java applets.

As to claim 3, Phanouriou as modified teaches the interface software components are arranged to generate forms corresponding to forms generated by the legacy software application (Figs. A, B, C and page 2).

As to claim 4, Phanouriou teaches the client interface components being arranged to interact over the network with the legacy software application (Fig. 3 and associated text; pages 5-6).

As to claim 5, Phanouriou teaches the client interface components include a user input object which is arranged to receive data input by a user of the network computing resource and transmit data to the legacy application, over the network (Figs. A, B, C, 3 and associated text).

As to claim 6, Phanouriou teaches the series of software components are loadable and executable by an Internet Browser (The HTTP server returns an applet; page 5).

As to claim 7, Phanouriou teaches the series of software components comprise Java code applet (applet; page 5 and Interface Client; page 6).

As to claim 10, Phanouriou teaches the network environment comprises the Internet network (Web page, URL; page 2).

As to claim 11, Eager teaches the network environment utilizes TCP/IP transfer protocols (TCP/IP; col. 22, lines 30-43).

As to claim 12, Phanouriou does not teach the source code is written in a 4GL language. Phanouriou teaches the legacy application in general and can be applied to multiple type of applications. It would have been obvious the legacy system of Phanouriou could also include the 4GL application.

As to claim 13, Phanouriou does not teach the source code is written in a LINC language. Phanouriou teaches the legacy application in general and can be applied to multiple types of applications. It would have been obvious the legacy system of Phanouriou could also include the LINC application.

Art Unit: 2194

As to claims 14 and 28, they correspond to the method claim of claim 1 except they are computer product and system claims, respectively.

As to claims 16-20, see rejections of claims 3-7 above.

As to claims 23-24, see rejections of claims 10-11 above.

As to claim 25, see rejection of claim 13 above.

As to claim 26, Eager teaches the terminal screen definitions are written in a screen control language (col. 30, lines 45-53).

As to claims 30-34, see rejections of claims 3-7 above.

As to claims 37-40, see rejections of claims 10-13 above.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-7, 10-14, 16-20, 23-26, 28, 30-34 and 37-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diem K. Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-3760. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 5:30AM - 2:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DC
September 14, 2006


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER